UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,601	12/22/2003	Gina D. Venolia	MS306728.1/MSFTP554US	7556

27195   7590   09/25/2007
AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
THERIAULT, STEVEN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/25/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 June 2007</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29 and 31-34</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29, 31-34</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>22 December 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 06/26/2007.

This action is made Final.

2.   Claims 1 –29, 31-34 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 23, 31, 32, and 33 are the independent

claims.

Drawings

3.   The updated specification to reflect the drawings was received on 06/26/2007. These drawings

are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   Claims 24 –30 and 34 have been amended to clarify the correct dependency and therefore the previous 112

rejection is moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions
and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-22 and 33-34 have been amended to include the step of "making graphically available" the

message content. The Examiner interprets the process as a rendering and transformation of

software into a tangible result on the display. Software cannot in stored or compiled form "make

content graphically available" without hardware. The present application specification states

"[0022] As used in this application, the terms "component" and "system" are intended to

refer to a computer-related entity, either hardware, a combination of hardware and

software, software, or software in execution." Therefore, the examiners interpretation is that

the component includes the hardware to render the content graphically on the display.

Claim 31 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory

subject matter. The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to

an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a

practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject

matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

IN regard to **claim 31,** claim 31 recites claim limitations that are not directed to a

statutory class of invention as the claimed system refers to a data packet. The data packet is not a process,

machine, article of manufacture or composition of matter. A claimed invention is directed to a practical

application of a 35 U.S.C. 101 judicial exception when it:

(A)   "transforms" an article or physical object to a different state or thing; or

(B)   otherwise produces a useful, concrete and tangible result,

The packet claim recites steps for adapting a packet to be transmitted between two computers.

While a data packet is not debated as a descriptive message that can contain content, the claim as a whole

does not recite the structure allowing the packet to be realized. A packet is a software based compilation of

bytes and the limitations do not recite a real world step that transforms the packet into a useful, tangible,

and concrete result and could be software per se. The claim does not have a structure for storing the packet,

sending the packet, receiving the packet, deciphering the packet etc. To make the claim clear, perhaps the

applicant can amend the claim to be one of the mediums in the specification as claimed and adding the

structure to put the claim into the class of invention as an apparatus or article of manufacture.

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C 101

(nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending

these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that forms the basis for all obviousness**

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention
was made.

7.   **Claims 1-29, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et**

al. U.S. Patent No. 6725228 issued Apr. 20, 2004 and filed Oct. 31, 2000, in view of Voticky

et al (hereinafter Voticky) U.S. patent no. 6351764 issued Feb. 26, 2002.

In regard to **Independent claim 1,** Clark teaches a system that facilitates content management,

comprising:

- A component that receives <u>message </u>content (Clark column 4, lines 25-50). Clark teaches

   a message store (See figure 4c, message store server).

- An organization component that <u>determines a pending or nonpending status of the</u>

   <u>message content and that </u>partitions and makes <u>graphically </u>available the content (Clark

   figure 3, 7, 17 and column 10, lines 5-10 and column 31, lines 1-50 and Table IV). Clark

   teaches organizing content into folders that are portioned and where content can exist in

   more then one folder. Clark teaches the content is made graphically available (See figure

   6) and the messages can have a variety of status where the kept messages are non-

   pending and the pending are the "todo" or "waiting send".

   Clark does not expressly teach:

- Organizing content as part of at least the following clusters: (1) un-accessed

   content, (2) un-accessed and pending content (3) pending content, and (4) accessed

   content

The present application specification defines an "un-accessed and pending cluster as including aspects of the un-accessed and pending clusters. The un-accessed cluster supports the users initial activity in determining what to do with a message and the pending cluster keeps track of reminders or pending items (See Para 0032-0033).

Using the intrinsic definition, Clark does teach a process of displaying messages based on attributes of the message that can include status of the message once, it has been received into the store. However, Clark does not expressly use the status identifiers of un-accessed, un-accessed and pending, pending and accessed. Clark teaches the user has the ability to create message rules and new folders of their choice (See column 33, lines 30-65 and column 38) however, Clark does not suggest the specific identifiers. Voticky teaches a process of displaying messages based on the prioritization of the users design (See column 4, lines 55-67). Voticky teaches that any number of folders and filtering schemes can be used, such as characteristics of the message or categories or status (See column 5, lines 30-40). Voticky teaches that the system can have an indefinite number of virtual boxes on the users computer (See column 5, lines 50-55). Voticky and Clark are analogous art because they both teach a graphical interface for managing email, they both teach organizing email into a category and they both teach putting the email into folders.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Clark and Voticky in front of them, to modify the system of Clark to show the folders with any status indicator the user chooses. The motivation to combine Voticky with Clark comes from the suggestion in Voticky that several schemes for prioritizing mailboxes are known in the art (See column 4, lines 60-67) and that the filtering mechanism can provide for greater advantages of discriminating incoming messages from one another.

With respect to **dependent claim 2,** as indicated in the above discussion Clark in view of Voticky teaches every element of claim 1.

Clark does not expressly teach the system the clusters of content are hierarchically displayed in the following order: (1) un-accessed, (2) un-accessed and pending, (3) pending, and (4) accessed. Clark does show the ability to display the mail in a hierarchical manner (See figure 1b and 6) but does not show the specific clusters mentioned above. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Voticky, because Voticky teaches that any number of status indicators can be added to a message and that any number of mailboxes can be hierarchically displayed on the screen, for example see Figure 4.

With respect to **dependent claims 3 - 5,** Clark teaches the system the content comprising messages, the content comprising media, computer-based applications (Clark column 8, lines 35-45).

With respect to **dependent claims 6 - 18,** Clark teaches that the system content can be clustered into a folder based at least in part on priority, preference, utility, cost, author, genre, criticality, age, context, size, rendering device, combination of two preferences, and user state. Clark column 10, lines 1-10 and column 41, lines 20-40. Clark teaches date, status, attachments, keywords (that can comprise any user choice input such as cost, author, genre, preference, etc). Moreover, the limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention, in view of Voticky, because Voticky teaches prioritizing or filtering email based on characteristics of the email, which can be interpreted to comprise a combination of the above (See column 4, lines 25-35, 60-67 and column 5, lines 1-10).

With respect to **dependent claim 19,** Clark teaches the system where the content is dynamically organized (Clark column 10, lines 4-7).

With respect to **dependent claim 20,** Clark teaches the system further comprising a cluster filtering component operatively connected between the receiving component and the organization component comprising one or more filters that directs content to at least one of the four clusters based at least in part upon user preferences (Clark column 13, lines 30-67 and column 14, lines

1-67). Clark shows a component the filters the messages into the folders. Each layer adds functionality to prioritize the messages into the correct folder based on a rule (See also figure 7). With respect to **dependent claim 21,** Clark teaches the system that the cluster-filtering component is trained using at least one of explicit user input or implicit user behavior (column 41, lines 20-40 and column 42, lines 20-30).

With respect to **dependent claim 22,** Clark teaches the system that one of the four clusters comprises at least one sub-filter that facilitates organizing content within any one of the clusters (Clark column 13, lines 30-67 and column 14, lines 1-67). Clark teaches numerous sub-filters.

In regard to **Independent claim 23,** Clark teaches a method that facilitates content management comprising:

- Receiving message content (Clark column 4, lines 25-50). Clark teaches receiving message content.

- Determining a pending and nonpending characteristic of the received message content (Clark figure 3, 7, 17 and column 10, lines 5-10 and column 31, lines 1-50 and Table IV). Clark teaches organizing content into folders that are portioned and where content can exist in more then one folder. Clark teaches the content is made graphically available (See figure 6) and the messages can have a variety of status where the kept messages are non-pending and the pending are the "todo" or "waiting send".

Clark does not expressly teach:

- Organizing content as part of at least the following clusters: (1) un-accessed content, (2) un-accessed and pending content (3) pending content, and (4) accessed content

The present application specification defines an un-accessed and pending cluster as including aspects of the un-accessed and pending clusters. The un-accessed cluster supports the users initial activity in determining what to do with a message and the pending cluster keeps track of reminders or pending items (See Para 0032-0033).

Using the intrinsic definition, Clark does teach a process of displaying messages based on attributes of the message that can include status of the message once, it has been received into the store. However, Clark does not expressly use the status identifiers of un-accessed, un-accessed and pending, pending and accessed. Clark teaches the user has the ability to create message rules and new folders of their choice (See column 33, lines 30-65 and column 38) however, Clark does not suggest the specific identifiers. Voticky teaches a process of displaying messages based on the prioritization of the users design (See column 4, lines 55-67). Voticky teaches that any number of folders and filtering schemes can be used, such as characteristics of the message or categories or status (See column 5, lines 30-40). Voticky teaches that the system can have an indefinite number of virtual boxes on the users computer (See column 5, lines 50-55). Voticky and Clark are analogous art because they both teach a graphical interface for managing email, they both teach organizing email into a category and they both teach putting the email into folders.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Clark and Voticky in front of them, to modify the system of Clark to show the folders with any status indicator the user chooses. The motivation to combine Voticky with Clark comes from the suggestion in Voticky that several schemes for prioritizing mailboxes are known in the art (See column 4, lines 60-67) and that the filtering mechanism can provide for greater advantages of discriminating incoming messages from one another.

With respect to **dependent claim 24,** as indicated in the above discussion Clark in view of Voticky teaches every element of claim 1.

Clark does not expressly teach the system the clusters of content are hierarchically displayed in the following order: (1) un-accessed, (2) un-accessed and pending, (3) pending, and (4) accessed. Clark does show the ability to display the mail in a hierarchical manner (See figure 1b and 6) but does not show the specific clusters mentioned above. However, this limitation would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Voticky,

because Voticky teaches that any number of status indicators can be added to a message and

that any number of mailboxes can be hierarchically displayed on the screen, for example see

Figure 4.

With respect to **dependent claim 25,** Clark teaches the method further comprising employing

one or more filters to organize at least a portion of the content as part of at least one of the

clusters (See figure 7 and column 13, lines 30-67) Clark teaches filters that organize the

information into folder and where the files can exist in more then one folder

With respect to **dependent claims 26-27,** Clark teaches the method where the content

comprises text messages or computer-based applications (Clark column 8, lines 35-45).

With respect to **dependent claim 28,** Clark teaches that the system content can be clustered into

a folder based at least in part on priority, preference, utility, cost, author, genre, criticality, age,

context, size, rendering device, combination of two preferences, and user state. Clark column 10,

lines 1-10 and column 41, lines 20-40. Clark teaches date, status, attachments, keywords (that

can comprise any user choice input such as cost, author, genre, preference, etc). Moreover, the

limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the at the time of the invention, in

view of Voticky, because Voticky teaches prioritizing or filtering email based on characteristics of

the email, which can be interpreted to comprise a combination of the above (See column 4, lines

25-35, 60-67 and column 5, lines 1-10).

With respect to **dependent claim 29,** Clark teaches the method where further comprising adding

one or more visual indicators to at least one cluster to facilitate content viewing and management

(Clark Figure 6 and column 12, lines 25-45).

In regard to **Independent claim 31,** Clark teaches a data packet adapted to be transmitted

between two or more computer processes facilitating providing suggestions to an online user, the

data packet comprising:

- Information associated with receiving content Clark figure 3, 7, 17 and column 10, lines 5-
10 and column 31, lines 1-50 and Table IV). Clark teaches organizing content into folders
where the messages have information used by the data store to organize the messages
into the folders

Clark does not expressly teach:

- Organizing content as part of at least the following clusters: (1) un-accessed
content, (2) un-accessed and pending content (3) pending content, and (4) accessed
content

The present application specification defines an un-accessed and pending cluster as

including aspects of the un-accessed and pending clusters. The un-accessed cluster supports the

users initial activity in determining what to do with a message and the pending cluster keeps track

of reminders or pending items (See Para 0032-0033).

Using the intrinsic definition, Clark does teach a process of displaying messages based

on attributes of the message that can include status of the message once, it has been received

into the store. However, Clark does not expressly use the status identifiers of un-accessed, un-

accessed and pending, pending and accessed. Clark teaches the user has the ability to create

message rules and new folders of their choice (See column 33, lines 30-65 and column 38)

however, Clark does not suggest the specific identifiers. Voticky teaches a process of displaying

messages based on the prioritization of the users design (See column 4, lines 55-67). Voticky

teaches that any number of folders and filtering schemes can be used, such as characteristics of

the message or categories or status (See column 5, lines 30-40). Voticky teaches that the system

can have an indefinite number of virtual boxes on the users computer (See column 5, lines 50-

55). Voticky and Clark are analogous art because they both teach a graphical interface for

managing email, they both teach organizing email into a category and they both teach putting the email into folders.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Clark and Voticky in front of them, to modify the system of Clark to show the folders with any status indicator the user chooses. The motivation to combine Voticky with Clark comes from the suggestion in Voticky that several schemes for prioritizing mailboxes are known in the art (See column 4, lines 60-67) and that the filtering mechanism can provide for greater advantages of discriminating incoming messages from one another.

In regard to **Independent claim 32,** Clark teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon the following computer executable components:

- A component that receives content (Clark column 4, lines 25-50). Clark teaches a message store (See figure 4c, message store server).

Clark does not expressly teach:

- Organizing content as part of at least the following clusters: (1) un-accessed content, (2) un-accessed and pending content (3) pending content, and (4) accessed content

The present application specification defines an un-accessed and pending cluster as including aspects of the un-accessed and pending clusters. The un-accessed cluster supports the users initial activity in determining what to do with a message and the pending cluster keeps track of reminders or pending items (See Para 0032-0033).

Using the intrinsic definition, Clark does teach a process of displaying messages based on attributes of the message that can include status of the message once; it has been received into the store. However, Clark does not expressly use the status identifiers of un-accessed, un-accessed and pending, pending and accessed. Clark teaches the user has the ability to create message rules and new folders of their choice (See column 33, lines 30-65 and column 38) however, Clark does not suggest the specific identifiers. Voticky teaches a process of displaying

messages based on the prioritization of the users design (See column 4, lines 55-67). Voticky teaches that any number of folders and filtering schemes can be used, such as characteristics of the message or categories or status (See column 5, lines 30-40). Voticky teaches that the system can have an indefinite number of virtual boxes on the users computer (See column 5, lines 50-55). Voticky and Clark are analogous art because they both teach a graphical interface for managing email, they both teach organizing email into a category and they both teach putting the email into folders.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Clark and Voticky in front of them, to modify the system of Clark to show the folders with any status indicator the user chooses. The motivation to combine Voticky with Clark comes from the suggestion in Voticky that several schemes for prioritizing mailboxes are known in the art (See column 4, lines 60-67) and that the filtering mechanism can provide for greater advantages of discriminating incoming messages from one another.

In regard to **Independent claim 33,** Clark teaches a system that facilitates content management comprising:

- Means for receiving content (Clark column 4, lines 25-50). Clark teaches a message store (See figure 4c, message store server).

Clark does not expressly teach:

- Organizing content as part of at least the following clusters: (1) un-accessed content, (2) un-accessed and pending content (3) pending content, and (4) accessed content

The present application specification defines an un-accessed and pending cluster as including aspects of the un-accessed and pending clusters. The un-accessed cluster supports the users initial activity in determining what to do with a message and the pending cluster keeps track of reminders or pending items (See Para 0032-0033).

Using the intrinsic definition, Clark does teach a process of displaying messages based on attributes of the message that can include status of the message once, it has been received into the store. However, Clark does not expressly use the status identifiers of un-accessed, un-accessed and pending, pending and accessed. Clark teaches the user has the ability to create message rules and new folders of their choice (See column 33, lines 30-65 and column 38) however, Clark does not suggest the specific identifiers. Voticky teaches a process of displaying messages based on the prioritization of the users design (See column 4, lines 55-67). Voticky teaches that any number of folders and filtering schemes can be used, such as characteristics of the message or categories or status (See column 5, lines 30-40). Voticky teaches that the system can have an indefinite number of virtual boxes on the users computer (See column 5, lines 50-55). Voticky and Clark are analogous art because they both teach a graphical interface for managing email, they both teach organizing email into a category and they both teach putting the email into folders.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Clark and Voticky in front of them, to modify the system of Clark to show the folders with any status indicator the user chooses. The motivation to combine Voticky with Clark comes from the suggestion in Voticky that several schemes for prioritizing mailboxes are known in the art (See column 4, lines 60-67) and that the filtering mechanism can provide for greater advantages of discriminating incoming messages from one another.

With respect to **dependent claim 34,** as indicated in the above discussion Clark in view of Voticky teaches every element of claim 33.

Clark does not expressly teach the system the clusters of content are hierarchically displayed in the following order: (1) un-accessed, (2) un-accessed and pending, (3) pending, and (4) accessed. Clark does show the ability to display the mail in a hierarchical manner (See figure 1b and 6) but does not show the specific clusters mentioned above. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Voticky, because Voticky teaches that any number of status indicators can be added to a message and

that any number of mailboxes can be hierarchically displayed on the screen, for example see

Figure 4.

**It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art
references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any
way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have
reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re *Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-
33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re *Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ
275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).**

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29, 31-34 have been considered but are moot in view of

the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the

extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from

the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date

of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can

normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven B Theriault/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2179

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER